

Legislation, Regulations, and Funding Committee
Minutes
June 15, 2011

**Planning Council Members
in Attendance:**

Barbara Mitchell, Chairperson
Gail Nickerson, Vice-Chair
Beverly Abbott
Cindy Claflin
Steven Grolnic-McClurg, LCSW
Carmen Lee
Adam Nelson, MD
Kathleen O'Meara, PhD
Mark Refowitz
John Ryan
Daphne Shaw
Stephanie Thal, MA, MFT
Jaye Vanderhurst, LCSW

Planning Council Staff in Attendance:

Ann Arneill-Py, PhD
Andi Murphy

Others in Attendance:

Steve Leoni
Kathy Trevino
Joseph Robinson

Update on May Revise

Andi Murphy provided an update on the May Revise, which is attached. In the ensuing discussing, the elimination of the Department of Mental Health (DMH) was discussed. The following points were made:

- ◆ Daphne Shaw and Ann Arneill-Py took a position to oppose the elimination of the DMH at the meeting on the future of the DMH sponsored by the California Coalition for Mental Health
- ◆ The Council should take a strong stand opposing the further breakup of the functions of the DMH. Advocacy would be too diluted if groups had to go from the Department of Social Services for Community Care Licensing to the Mental Health Oversight Accountability Commission, to the Department of Health Care Services, to the Department of State Hospitals to even more places for other functions

Review Work Plan

Conference Call with Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission

The committee discussed the conference call that was supposed to take place between our Leadership and the Mental Health Oversight and Accountability Commission (MHSOAC) Leadership. The conference call had not yet happened. The following points were made:

- ◆ The purpose is to clarify the respective duties of each organization; for example, we are responsible for reviewing and approving performance indicators
- ◆ We should wait until the Coalition group completes its work so we know what duties are being recommended for each entity, including the DMH or its successor, the MHSOAC, and the Planning Council
- ◆ Is the purpose of the call to affirm our general goal of working together to partner on advocacy? Committee members affirmed that we already have established that level of communication with the MHSOAC. The Executive Officer of the Planning

Council is in regular communication with the Executive Director of the MHSOAC., and Planning Council members have relationships with MHSOAC commissioners

Sponsoring Legislation

The committee focused on the task for the October meeting to sponsor legislation

- ◆ Does the Planning Council have the authority to sponsor legislation? Yes, we do. We have already done it twice.
- ◆ We need to develop a procedure for sponsorship of legislation. It needs to address the following issues
 - Who approves the ideas for legislation: the Executive Committee or the whole Council?
 - How do we involve the whole Council in developing ideas for legislation? The committees should have a chance to recommend legislation.
 - What is the timing for this process? The Executive Committee and the Planning Council would need to approve legislation to sponsor at the October meeting prior to the legislative session. When should the Legislation, Regulation, and Funding Committee solicit ideas from other committees and come up with its own ideas?

Review Bill File

The committee discussed the fact that there were many bills in the bill file and that it was difficult to determine where to focus their attention; e.g., which bills were the most important. Arneill-Py explained the priority setting criteria:

Priority 1: bills that directly affect the lives of mental health clients

Priority 2: bills that indirectly affect the lives of mental health clients

Priority 3: bills to watch because they are spot bills or they are about other service system that are related to the mental health system

Developing Positions on Bills

The committee came up with the following process for reviewing the bill file:

- ◆ Staff will assign priorities to bills using the criteria outlined above
- ◆ Committee members will review the bill file to determine if they agree with the priorities and can make changes as they deem appropriate
- ◆ Staff will review all the bills and will determine which ones fall within the Planning Council's platform and will label them as such on the bill file
- ◆ Staff will identify for the committee bills that the Mental Health Irregulars are highlighting as important bills, which will be important bills for the committee to discuss
- ◆ Planning Council members can also identify bills that they want to have discussed. This would need to be done approximately 6 weeks prior to the meeting.

AB 194

The committee discussed what position we should take on AB 194 (Beall). The recommendation was that we not take a position on the bill. Arguments include that, although the bill related to foster children, it does not directly relate to youth with mental illness. In addition, there are lots of politics related to how universities set up priorities are accepting students. Any time you set up a priority, it you create problems for other groups of students. The committee concluded that we should watch the bill and move it to Priority 3.

Controversial Bills

Members of the Planning Council noted that very controversial bills have been brought to the Planning Council for disposition and have been resolved by majority vote. The committee discussed the fact that it would be a good venue to have an initial discussion of these bills because it had more time to consider the issues and then make a recommendation to the Planning Council. The committee raised the issue of whether it would take a majority vote or a two-thirds vote on controversial bills, but it did not resolve the issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Arneill-Py, PhD
Executive Officer